REMARKS

Claims 1-42, 46-58, 51, 52 and 54-60 are all the claims pending in the application each of which stand rejected. By this Amendment, Applicant amends claims 52, 55, 57, 59, and 60.

Statement of Substance of the Interview

Applicant thanks the Examiner for the courteous in person interview held on September 9, 2005. An Examiner's Interview Summary Record (PTO-413) was mailed to the Applicant on September 23, 2005. The PTO-413 requires the Applicant to file a Statement of Substance of the Interview. The Statement of Substance of the Interview is as follows.

During the interview independent claims 1, 46, 54-56, 58, and 60 were discussed in view Banthia. The Examiner maintained that Banthia unequivocally discloses all of the unique features of these claims. Possible amendments were discussed but no agreement was reached. Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to reconsider this rejection in view of the comments provided below.

It is respectfully submitted that the instant Statement of Substance of Interview complies with the requirements of 37 C.F.R. §§1.2 and 1.133 and MPEP §713.04.

It is believed that no petition or fee is required. However, if the USPTO deems otherwise, Applicant hereby petitions for any extension of time which may be required to maintain the pendency of this application, and any required fee, except for the Issue Fee, for such extension is to be charged to Deposit Account No. 19-4880.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

Claims 1-4, 9-12, 14-18, 23-26, 28-32, 37-40, 42, 46-48 and 51-60 are rejected under 35

U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by WO 98/43170 to Banthia (hereinafter "Banthia").

Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection in view of the following comments.

To be an "anticipation" rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102, the reference must teach <u>every</u>

<u>element and recitation of the Applicant's claims</u>. Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102 are proper

only when the claimed subject matter is identically disclosed or described in the prior art. Thus,

the reference must clearly and unequivocally disclose every element and recitation of the

claimed invention.

Independent claim 1 recites "generating separate windows within a main applet for each

selected applet; and the main applet executing each applet in a separate window." The Examiner

asserts that Banthia discloses the above recited unique features of claim 1. Applicant

respectfully disagrees.

For example, in an illustrative, non-limiting embodiment, a WebTop is a dynamic

environment in which any applet can run, (¶¶ 37 and 46-48 of the specification). The WebTop is

a main applet that allows other applets to run inside of it, and is not related to providing any

direct applet to applet communication environment. Each applet added to the WebTop, from

various servers or other machines, runs inside its own window that can be moved, resized,

minimized or closed. The WebTop has a menu of applets that are available to run and the ability

to scan other web pages and add any found applets to the repository of available applets, (¶¶ 55-

62 of the specification). It will be appreciated that the foregoing remarks relate to the application

in a general sense, the remarks are not limitative of any claims and are intended only to help the

Examiner better understand the distinguishing aspects of the claims mentioned above.

Banthia, on the other hand, relates to improving communication between applets by

optimizing the number of connections to the server (*see* Abstract). Specifically, Banthia

discloses that a client is connected to a particular Web server (page 5, lines 19 to 22) and a

controlling applet provides data to a set of display applets (page 5, lines 23 to 25). In Banthia,

the controlling applet is a hidden applet, which is not displayed (page 5, lines 33 to 35). The

controlling applet is also an active applet, which means that it establishes a connection to the

server. The set of display applets are passive applets, which means that they do not establish a

connection to the server. Even though the passive applets do not have a connection to the server,

their information is continually updated by the controlling applet (page 6, lines 2 to 9).

In Banthia, however, the display applets are displayed within a single browser window

(page 8, lines 19 to 21). Banthia, however, does not teach or suggest generating separate

windows within the main applet for each selected applet. That is, Banthia does not disclose

displaying an applet within the main applet.

Moreover, if the Examiner alleges that Banthia's disclosure of the user sequentially

moving one applet after another from one window to another ("tearing off an applet") anticipates

the user selection of a plurality of applets (*see* page 2 of the Office Action), then Banthia fails to

disclose generating a separate window for the "torn off" applet. In fact, Banthia discloses "the

user can move the particular display applet to another window," thereby, the torn off applet will

be at another screen location (page 8, lines 25 to 38). However, Banthia fails to disclose

generating a separate window for the "torn off applet." Furthermore, Banthia fails to disclose

generating separate windows within the main applet.

In short, it is respectfully submitted that Banthia does not teach or suggest generating

separate windows within a main applet for each selected applet; and the main applet executing

each applet in a separate window, as recited in claim 1. Claims 15, 29, 46 and 57 require similar

limitations. Since Banthia fails to disclose the above-recited features, it is respectfully submitted

that Banthia does not anticipate independent claims 1, 15, 29, 46, and 57, or the claims that

depend therefrom.

In addition, dependent claim 52 recites "said plurality of applets are independent from

each other." Banthia only discloses displaying one model of data in multiple views (Fig. 5).

That is, in Banthia, the displayed applets are interdependent. The displayed applets all depend

from the same base class i.e., inherit features of the same base class (Fig. 3; page 7, lines 24 to

34). For at least this additional reason, claim 52 patentably distinguishes from Banthia.

In addition, dependent claim 54 recites: "the receiving comprises receiving substantially

the at same time the user selection of the plurality of applets." Banthia only discloses a user

tearing off an applet by clicking on the window icon at the upper left corner of each display

applet. After this applet is torn off, the user may "tear off" another applet (page 8, lines 25 to

38). That is, Banthia fails to disclose receiving at substantially the same time a user selection of

the plurality of applets at least because the operations are clearly sequential in Banthia. For at

least this additional reason, claim 54 patentably distinguishes from Banthia.

15

Independent claim 57 further recites: "dynamically selecting a plurality of applets for a display from a list naming the plurality of applets displayed in the main applet." In Banthia, an already loaded and displayed applet may be "torn off" the single browser window (Fig. 3 and page 8). Banthia, however, does not disclose selecting from a list naming the plurality of applets and then loading the selected applets. In Banthia, the applets displayed in the single browser window are already loaded. Moreover, the displayed applets are the applets themselves and not a list naming the applets. For at least this additional reason, claim 57 patentably distinguishes from Banthia.

Dependent claim 58 recites: "wherein the main applet is a platform for running any applet". Banthia fails to disclose a main applet, which is a platform that can run any applets. In Banthia, only interdependent applets are displayed within a single browser window. For at least this additional reason, claim 58 patentably distinguishes from Banthia.

Dependent claim 59 recites: "wherein the main applet is a platform for dynamically running independent applets, and wherein each of said windows for the independent applets are resizable." Banthia fails to disclose running independent applets within an applet and having the independent applets be resizable. That is, Banthia discloses "tearing off" a display applet (page 4, lines 14 to 17). In Banthia, however, the size for the applet is pre-set (page 8, lines 19 to 24), and there is no disclosure in Banthia that the applet may be resized. For at least these additional reasons, claim 59 patentably distinguishes from Banthia.

Dependent claim 60 recites: "wherein said applets are obtained from different computers." In Banthia, all applets are from a single server, where the communication with the

server is optimized by having one communication applet handling the communication for all these applets. That is, Banthia fails to disclose the applets being obtained from different computers. For at least this additional reason, claim 60 patentably distinguishes from Banthia.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 5-8, 19-22, and 33-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Banthia in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,561,757 to Southgate (hereinafter "Southgate") and claims 13, 27, and 41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Banthia and "The Swing Tool Set" article (hereinafter "STS").

It is respectfully submitted that Southgate and the STS reference fail to cure the deficiencies of Banthia discussed above for claims 1, 15, and 29, and accordingly, claims 5-8, 13, 19-22, 27, 33-36, and 41 are patentable over the asserted combination, of Banthia and Southgate and Banthia and the STS reference, at least by virtue of their dependency from the independent claims discussed above.

Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly invited to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111
U.S. Appln. No. 09/747,063
Attorney Docket No.: A8063

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue

Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any

overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

Nataliya Dvorson
Registration No. 56,616

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE
23373
CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: November 7, 2005   Attorney Docket No.: A8063